



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/421,625

10/19/1999

EUGENE P. MARSH

M122-1284

4404

21567

7590

08/26/2002

WELLS ST. JOHN ROBERTS GREGORY & MATKIN P.S.  
601 W. FIRST AVENUE  
SUITE 1300  
SPOKANE, WA 99201-3828

EXAMINER

VU, HUNG K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

16

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/421,625

Applicant(s)

MARSH, EUGENE P.

Examiner

Hung K. Vu

Art Unit

2811

-- *Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 65-67, 74, 77-81 and 83-96 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 65-67, 74, 77-81 and 83-96 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Request for Continued Examination*

1 A request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/13/02 has been entered. An action on the RCE follows.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakamura (PN 6,232,629, of record).

Art Unit: 2811

Nakamura discloses a capacitor comprising,

a first capacitor electrode (32) over a monocrystalline silicon substrate (102);

a second capacitor electrode (35);

a dielectric layer (8) between the first and second capacitor electrodes;

wherein at least one of the first and second capacitor electrodes comprise roughened platinum, the roughened platinum having a continuous surface characterized by columnar pedestals having heights greater than or equal to about one-third of a total thickness of the roughened platinum. Note Figures 1 – 35 (especially Figures 2, 3A, 7 – 10D, and 24 – 32) of Nakamura.

3. Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aoki et al. (PN 6,033,953, of record)

Aoki et al. discloses a capacitor comprising,

a first capacitor electrode (38) over a monocrystalline silicon substrate (1);

a second capacitor electrode (37);

a dielectric layer (40) between the first and second capacitor electrodes;

wherein at least one of the first and second capacitor electrodes comprise roughened platinum, the roughened platinum having a continuous surface characterized by columnar pedestals having heights greater than or equal to about one-third of a total thickness of the roughened platinum. Note Figures 1A-14 (especially Figures 1B-1D) of Aoki et al..

Art Unit: 2811

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 65-67, 77, 85-89 and 92-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki et al. (PN 6,033,953, of record) in view of Kingon et al. (PN 5,555,486, of record).

Aoki et al. discloses a capacitor comprising,

a substrate (1);

a roughened platinum layer (38) over the substrate, the roughened platinum layer having a continuous surface characterized by columnar pedestals;

an intervening layer (39) between the platinum layer and the substrate. Note Figures 1A-14 (especially Figures 1B-1D) of Aoki et al..

Aoki et al. discloses the intervening layer comprising titanium nitride. Aoki et al. does not disclose the intervening layer comprising at least one of IrO<sub>2</sub>, RuO<sub>2</sub>, RhO<sub>2</sub>, or OsO<sub>2</sub>. However, Kingon et al. discloses an intervening layer (22), formed under a platinum layer (23), comprising at least one of IrO<sub>2</sub>, RuO<sub>2</sub>, RhO<sub>2</sub>, or OsO<sub>2</sub>. Note Figures 1a of Kingon et al.. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the intervening layer of Aoki et al.'s comprising at least one of IrO<sub>2</sub>, RuO<sub>2</sub>, RhO<sub>2</sub>, or OsO<sub>2</sub>, such as taught by Kingon et al. in order to improve the capacitor performance both in terms of fatigue and leakage current.

Although Aoki et al. and Kingon et al. do not teach exact the thickness of the platinum layer, the height of columnar pedestals, and the average diameter of the columnar pedestals, as that claimed by Applicants, however, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the platinum layer and the columnar pedestals of Aoki et al. and Kingon et al. having a desire thickness, height and average diameter, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

With regard to claim 66, Aoki et al. and Kingon et al. disclose wherein the pedestals terminate in dome-shaped tops.

With regard to claim 67, Aoki et al. and Kingon et al. disclose wherein the pedestals terminate in hemispherical tops.

With regard to claim 85, Aoki et al. and Kingon et al. disclose all of the claimed limitations except the roughened platinum layer comprises a platinum alloy comprising platinum and at least one of rhodium, ruthenium or palladium. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the roughened platinum layer comprises a platinum alloy comprising platinum and at least one of rhodium, ruthenium or palladium in order to provide thermal stability at high temperatures.

With regard to claims 92-96, the terms “formed by a process comprising: ... depositing”, the oxidizing gas ... 1 to 3”, “the platinum precursor ... platinum hexafluoroacetylacetonate”, “the maintaining a temperature ... 280C”, and flowing at least one other metal precursor ... at least one other metal” are method recitations in a device claimed, and they are non-limiting, because only the final product is relevant, not the method of making. A product by process claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made. See also MPEP 2113. Moreover, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not a patentable product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not.

5. Claims 92-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buskirk et al. (PN 6,010,744, of record).

Buskirk et al. discloses, as shown in Figure 1E, a capacitor comprising,

- a first capacitor electrode (18) over a monocrystalline silicon substrate;
- a second capacitor electrode (20a);
- a dielectric layer (19) between the first and second capacitor electrodes;
- at least one of the first and second capacitor electrodes comprising roughened platinum.

Note that the terms “formed by a process comprising: ... depositing”, the oxidizing gas ... 1 to 3”, “the platinum precursor ... platinum hexafluoroacetylacetonate”, “the maintaining a temperature ... 280C”, and flowing at least one other metal precursor ... at least one other metal” are method recitations in a device claimed, and they are non-limiting, because only the final product is relevant, not the method of making. A product by process claim is directed to the

Art Unit: 2811

product per se, no matter how actually made. See also MPEP 2113. Moreover, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not a patentable product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not.

6. Claims 65-67, 77-81 and 83-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura (PN 6,232,629, of record).

Nakamura discloses a capacitor comprising,

a substrate (102);

a roughened platinum layer (112) over the substrate, the roughened platinum layer having a continuous surface characterized by columnar pedestals;

an intervening layer (111) between the platinum layer and the substrate, the intervening layer comprising at least one of  $\text{IrO}_2$ ,  $\text{RuO}_2$ ,  $\text{RhO}_2$ , or  $\text{OsO}_2$ . Note Figures 1 – 35 (especially Figures 2, 3A, 7 – 10D, and 24 – 32) of Nakamura.

Nakamura does not teach the exact the thickness of the platinum layer, the height of columnar pedestals, and the average diameter of the columnar pedestals, as that claimed by Applicants, however, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the platinum layer and the columnar pedestals of Nakamura having a desire thickness, height and average diameter, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).



Art Unit: 2811

With regard to claim 66, Nakamura discloses wherein the pedestals terminate in dome-shaped tops.

With regard to claims 67 and 84, Nakamura discloses wherein the pedestals terminate in hemispherical tops.

With regard to claim 85, Nakamura discloses all of the claimed limitations except the roughened platinum layer comprises a platinum alloy comprising platinum and at least one of rhodium, ruthenium or palladium. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the roughened platinum layer comprises a platinum alloy comprising platinum and at least one of rhodium, ruthenium or palladium in order to provide thermal stability at high temperatures.

With regard to claims 92-96, the terms “formed by a process comprising: ... depositing”, the oxidizing gas ... 1 to 3”, “the platinum precursor ... platinum hexafluoroacetylacetonate”, “the maintaining a temperature ... 280C”, and flowing at least one other metal precursor ... at least one other metal” are method recitations in a device claimed, and they are non-limiting, because only the final product is relevant, not the method of making. A product by process claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made. See also MPEP 2113. Moreover, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not a patentable product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not.

*Response to Arguments*

7. Applicant's arguments filed 06/13/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is argued, at pages 6-8 of the Remarks, that Nakamura does not disclose the roughened platinum. This argument is not convincing because Nakamura discloses, as shown in Figures 2, 8 and 26, the platinum layer having a roughened surface.

It is argued, at pages 10-11 of the Remarks, that Aoki et al. does not disclose a roughened platinum layer characterized by columnar pedestals. This argument is not convincing because Aoki et al. shows, in red-mark Figures 1A – 1D, a roughened platinum layer characterized by columnar pedestals. Note that platinum, when is formed, usually has columnar crystal structure, (as shown in Figure 2 of Nakamura).

It is argued, at page 12 of the Remarks, that the combination of Aoki et al. and Kingon et al. does not teach the roughened platinum. This argument is not convincing because Aoki et al. discloses a roughened platinum for the reason as stated above.

The rejection of claims 78-81 over Buskirk et al. in view of Park et al. is accordingly withdrawn due to amendments to claim 78.

Art Unit: 2811

It is argued, at pages 13-14 of the Remarks, that Nakamura does not disclose roughened platinum. This argument is not convincing because Nakamura discloses a roughened platinum for the reason as stated above.

It is argued, at page 15 of the Remarks, that none of the references discloses the limitations of the product-by-process claim 92. This argument is not convincing because a product by process claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made. See also MPEP 2113. Moreover, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not a patentable product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not.

### *Conclusion*

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung K. Vu whose telephone number is (703) 308-4079. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:00-5:30, Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on (703) 308-2772. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Application/Control Number: 09/421,625

Page 11

Art Unit: 2811

Vu

August 21, 2002

Steven Loke